REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on <u>November 30, 2004</u>, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

§*102 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1-16 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Henrikson (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,673). This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis that the reference does not show each and every element of the claimed invention.

In various embodiments of the invention, packets on a bus are intercepted, and the text file is used to provide a user with an explanation of what various packet fields mean by providing values and/or explanations of the fields. Page 17, Conclusion. In Henrikson, the user specifies the types of packets to be collected. No discussion of providing explanations of fields of packets intercepted was found in Henrikson. In Henrikson, a user interface allows a user to "choose specific trigger events for capturing data with is transmitted on the IEEE 1394 serial bus network. The system translates the selected trigger events into a predetermined sequence of digital data." Col. 5, lines 17-20. Thus, only packets that meet the trigger event are collected based on the trigger events. There is no initial selection of a frame to be analyzed followed by using the text file to identify function code formats and calculating values for fields based on the function code formats as claimed in claims 1-9.

Claims 10-23 all recite the provision of a user viewable interpretation of received frames or packets in a frame. As indicated above, no such interpretation appears to be provided by Henrikson. As at least one element of each of the claims is lacking from Henrikson, a proper prima facie case of anticipation has not been established, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action indicates that Henrikson shows "the frame is the event selected to be monitored" Col. 4, lines 65 through col. 5, line 2. This statement is not clear. The referenced language describes "allowing a user to specify that the data captured will trigger or begin upon the occurrence of certain events, such as the detection of a specific packet header, field or data pattern, an error, or a specific time or cycle event." This language supports applicant's

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 09/849,916
Filing Date: May 4, 2001
Title: PROCESS CONTROL BUS MONITORING AND ANALYSIS

Page 6
Dkt: H00-01602

interpretation that a user sets filters to determine what frames to capture, and has nothing to do with providing information or interpretation of the data in the frame as claimed.

The Office Action further states "where providing the user choices would involve some text based user readable file that is then translated to the related digital code" This statement appears to rely on inherency without the requisite showing that the claimed element necessarily flows from the teaching. Further, the organization of this element in Henrikson is very different from the organization in claim 1. In claim 1, the text file is used to calculate values for fields of a selected frame. In Henrikson, the alleged text file would be used to select filters, which then results in selection of the frames. There is no use of the text file to interpret the data in the frame or packets of the frame.

The Office Action also states that Henrikson, col. 5, lines 35-47 describes "calculating values for fields based on the function code formats". In fact, the language describes different types of filters, such as one the captures "all response retry timeout errors…and a predetermined number of bytes of data transmitted after the error message." Applicant fails to see how this language describes calculating values for fields of a selected frame to be analyzed based on the function code formats. Henrikson only describes how to select frames based on filters, not how to interpret the frames once captured.

The dependent claims all depend from an independent claim that is believed allowable. Applicant reserves the right to provide further reasons why such dependent claims are believed allowable should this amendment not overcome the rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 17 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6972 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SREEKANTH VOLETI ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6972

Date 2-24-2005   By _____
                              Bradley A. Forrest
                              Reg. No. 30,837

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 24th day of February, 2005.

_____   _____

Name   Signature